

JEFFREY WOOD
Acting Assistant Attorney General
ERIC GRANT
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

SARAH D. HIMMELHOCH (MD Bar. No. 199212160064)
Senior Litigation Counsel
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 514-0180
Facsimile: (202) 514-0097
sarah.himmelhoch@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Federal Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,) Case No. 3:17-cv-00101-SLG
)
v.)
)
DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

**NOTICE OF ERRATA FOR
DEFENDANTS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Defendants hereby submit the attached corrected table of contents for their Reply

Memorandum in Support of their Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment. The correction removes text erroneously included in the table of contents and ensures all section headings are included in the table.

Dated: October 9, 2018

Respectfully submitted,
JEFFREY WOOD
Acting Assistant Attorney General
ERIC GRANT
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Environment & Natural Resources Division

/s/
SARAH D. HIMMELHOCH
MD Bar. No. 199212160064
Senior Litigation Counsel
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 514-0180
Facsimile: (202) 514-0057
sarah.himmelhoch@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on October 9, 2018, I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will provide service to all attorneys of record.

/s/
Sarah D. Himmelhoch
Attorney for Defendants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	2
A.	The Law of the Case Doctrine Does Not Bar The Court From Determining Whether There Is Jurisdiction To Decide Plaintiffs' Claims	2
B.	Plaintiffs Lack Article III Standing.....	4
C.	Plaintiffs' <i>Ultra Vires</i> Claims Fail as a Matter of Law	7
1.	Plaintiffs' Interpretation of OCSLA is Contrary the Language of Section 12(a), the Structure and Purpose of the Statute, and Its Legislative History.....	7
a.	The Language of Section 12(a).....	7
i.	The Phrase "from Time to Time".....	7
ii.	Other Statutes Using the Term "Withdrawal"	9
iii.	Changes in Policy	13
b.	The Structure and Purpose of OCSLA.....	17
c.	The Legislative History.....	18
2.	Executive Order No. 13795 Continues the Precedent Set By Prior Actions Under OCSLA	21
3.	Congress Acquiesced in the President's Modification of Former Withdrawals	23
D.	Plaintiffs Are Not Entitled to An Injunction.....	24
III.	CONCLUSION.....	25